

# الانفتاح لمشكلاتٍ تلخيص المفتاح

BY HUMAIR NASIM



---

## Foreword

---

الحمد لله و الصلوة و السلام على رسول الله

The title of this booklet is self-explanatory; nonetheless, this booklet is meant to clarify some of the harder parts of تلخيص المفتاح. It doesn't cover majority of the book, barely some of it, but إن شاء الله you will find it beneficial.

I would like to thank my teacher, who taught this book and clarified it like no one else could have, without him this would not have been possible to write. Mainly because he encouraged me to.

If you think you've found any mistakes, that is very well possible. I suggest you read مختصر معاني, it should clarify most of this booklet as well.

A kind request to make du'a for me, that Allah increases my knowledge and gives me a death in the state of imaan.

و بالله التوفيق

On page 11-12 there is a discussion regarding what constitutes as a truth and lie.

According to the majority, the definitions are as follows:

- Truthfulness of a report: Its accordance with reality
- Untruthfulness of a report: Its lack of accordance with reality

Nizaam al-Mu'tazili defines them differently:

- Truthfulness of a report: Its accordance with the belief of the informer, even if not in accordance with reality
- Untruthfulness of a report: Its lack of accordance with the belief of the informer

So, regarding the example: "The punishment of the grave won't occur," the majority would call this a lie, regardless of who said it. According to Nizaam this would be the truth if said by a Mu'tazili.

Nizaam justifies his position with the following verse:

إِذَا جَاءَكَ الْمُنَافِقُونَ قَالُوا نَشْهَدُ إِنَّكَ لَرَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ إِنَّكَ لَرَسُولُهُ وَاللَّهُ يَشْهَدُ إِنَّ الْمُنَافِقِينَ لَكَاذِبُونَ (al-Munafiqoon 1)

He argues that the hypocrites were called liars because their statement was not according to their belief.

This is notion of his is replied to in several ways:

1. They brought emphasis in their speech, creating the impression that their testimony was from the bottom of their heart. Since it wasn't, it didn't conform with reality, hence they were called liars.
2. They lied in declaring their statement to be a testimony. A testimony is that which is in accordance with one's beliefs, as this wasn't the case, they were declared liars.
3. They were called liars because they were saying something **they** didn't believe to be true (i.e. إِنَّكَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ), even though it is true in reality. But in the hypocrites their own minds, they were liars as they were saying something that **doesn't accord with reality** (to them).

The subtlety in the third point is that they knew they were lying because they didn't believe the Holy Prophet to be a Messenger of Allah. *They weren't lying because they said something they didn't believe in* (as per Nizaam's point). They were lying because *they said something that didn't accord with reality* (to them).

Another example to understand the third point: Take a flat-earthier, for example, who says "The earth is spherical." According to Nizaam he would be a liar because he is saying something that

doesn't accord with his beliefs, even though it accords with **our** reality. According to the majority he would be a liar because he is saying something that is contrary to **his** (false) reality.

The مخالفة واقعهم الفاسد as per Nizaam would be مخالفة الاعتقاد; as per the majority it would be مخالفة واقعهم الفاسد.

Contemplate the third point carefully, lest you misunderstand.

### *Isnaad Majazi or Isti'arah?*

On page 15-18 the types of إسناد are discussed and consequently some examples are given. To quickly recap the types:

حقيقة عقلية: هي إسناد الفعل أو معناه إلى ما هو له عند [اعتقاد] المتكلم في الظاهر

It is the إسناد of a verb or something in its meaning to whom it actually is for (e.g. نائب الفاعل or فاعل), according to the apparent belief of the speaker.

E.g. a Muslim saying: أَنبَتَ الرَّبِيعُ الْبَقْلَ and a disbeliever saying: أَنبَتَ الرَّبِيعُ الْبَقْلَ

مجاز عقلي: هو إسنادهما إلى ملابسٍ له غير ما هو له بَتَأْوِيلٍ

It is the إسناد of one of those two to something that it is closely associated/related to those two, other than whom the action is actually for (i.e. not the نائب الفاعل or فاعل - the متعلقات). All of this with a hint that the apparent isn't intended.

E.g. أَنبَتَ الرَّبِيعُ الْبَقْلَ (when said by a Muslim), (His day is fasting) نَهَارُهُ صَائِمٌ. In these examples the action is being linked to someone who isn't truly performing the action.

On page 19 it is mentioned that Sakkaki rejects this notion:

(وَأَنكَرَهُ) أَي: الْحَازِ الْعَقْلِيُّ أَبُو يَعْقُوبَ بُوَسْفُ (السَّكَّاكِيُّ) حَالُ كَوْنِهِ (ذَاهِبًا إِلَى أَنَّ مَا هُوَ) مِنْ أَمْلَةٍ الْحَازِ الْعَقْلِيِّ (وَنَحْوِهِ) كَقَوْلِ الْمُؤْمِنِ: «شَفَى الطَّبِيبُ الْمَرِيضَ» (استعارة بالكناية) وَهِيَ أَنَّ يَشْبَهُ الْفَاعِلَ الْحَازِي بِالْفَاعِلِ الْحَقِيقِيِّ فِي تَعَلُّقِ الْفِعْلِ بِكُلِّ مَنْهَمَا ثُمَّ يُذَكَّرُ الْمَشَبَّهِ وَيُرَادُ بِهِ الْمَشَبَّهِ بِمَعِ ادِّعَاءِ أَنَّ الْمَشَبَّهِ فَرْدٌ مِنْ أَفْرَادِهِ بِقَرِينَةٍ نَسْبَةٍ لِأَزْمِ الْمَشَبَّهِ بِهِ إِلَى الْمَشَبَّهِ، فَيَكُونُ «أَنبَتَ الرَّبِيعَ الْبَقْلَ» استعارة بالكناية بِنَاءً (عَلَى أَنَّ الْمُرَادَ بِالرَّبِيعِ) الَّذِي هُوَ فَاعِلٌ مُحَازِيٌّ لِلْإِنْبَاتِ وَمَشَبَّهِ (الْفَاعِلِ الْحَقِيقِيِّ) الَّذِي هُوَ مَشَبَّهِ بِهِ (بِقَرِينَةٍ نَسْبَةٍ لِلْإِنْبَاتِ) الَّذِي هُوَ لِأَزْمِ الْفَاعِلِ الْحَقِيقِيِّ (إِلَيْهِ) أَي: إِلَى الرَّبِيعِ، مُتَعَلِّقٌ بِالنِّسْبَةِ (و) يَجْرِي (عَلَى هَذَا الْقِيَاسِ غَيْرُهُ) أَي: غَيْرُ هَذَا الْمَثَالِ، فَيُرَادُ بِالطَّبِيبِ فِي «شَفَى الطَّبِيبَ الْمَرِيضَ» الْفَاعِلَ الْحَقِيقِيَّ بِقَرِينَةٍ نَسْبَةٍ لِأَزْمِهِ إِلَيْهِ وَهُوَ الشِّفَاءُ (وَفِيهِ) أَي: فِي حِجْلِ الْحَازِ الْعَقْلِيِّ استعارة بالكناية (نَظَرُ لِأَنَّهُ) أَي: الْجَعْلُ الْمَذْكُورُ (يَسْتَلْزِمُ أَنَّ يَكُونُ الْمُرَادُ بِهِ عَيْشَةٌ فِي قَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى: ﴿فَلَهُمْ فِي عَيْشَتِهِمْ نَارٌ﴾) صَاحِبُهَا لِأَنَّ الْعَيْشَةَ فَاعِلٌ مُحَازِيٌّ فَيَكُونُ الْمُرَادُ بِهِ الْفَاعِلَ الْحَقِيقِيَّ وَهُوَ صَاحِبُ الْعَيْشَةِ فَيُزْمُ أَنَّ يَكُونُ صَاحِبُ الْعَيْشَةِ فِي صَاحِبِ الْعَيْشَةِ وَهُوَ بَاطِلٌ (و) يَسْتَلْزِمُ (أَنَّ لَا تَصَحُّ الْإِصَافَةُ فِي نَحْوِ «نَهَارُهُ صَائِمٌ») أَي: فِي كُلِّ

Sakkaki rejects the notion of مجاز عقلي, opining that whatever example preceded is in fact استعارة بالكناية.

Note: استعارة is a مجاز whose علاقة is مشابهة. Three things are omitted: 1 of the طرفان, وجه التشبه, and the أداة.

So where we say that it will be مجاز عقلي, he retorts by saying that is not it. He says the word will be made مجاز, then narrowing it down to استعارة مكنية, because only the مشبه is mentioned and the مشبه به is intended. The وجه التشبه would then be فاعلية (being the doer of the action).

So according to him, what is intended with الربيع is the فاعل حقيقي (which is the مشبه به - Allah), because of the إسناد of إنبات to الربيع. This is problematic in the following verse:

فَهُوَ فِي عِيشَةٍ رَاضِيَةٍ (7 al-Qari'ah)

Because according to Sakkaki, what is intended with عيشة is the possessor of the life - صاحبها. But if the word عيشة were to be replaced by صاحبها (the فاعل حقيقي), it wouldn't make sense. The meaning would then be:

فهو في صاحبها الراضية

The other arising problem would be in the example: نهاره صائم (His day is fasting), as the intended with نهار would be the person himself. The problem with that would be that something would be مضاف towards itself - as نهار refers to the فاعل حقيقي, i.e. the person, but so does the مضاف إليه. The other issue would be the presence of the مشبه به in مضاف إليه form, so it couldn't be استعارة in the first place.

---

### *To taqdeem or to not taqdeem?*

---

Over the span of page 32-34, the following is being said by Abdul Qahir regarding the taqdeem of مسند إليه:

Taqdeem of the مسند إليه.:

A: If it is معرفة

1. And follows after a حرف نفي, then it will be for تخصيص only. E.g. ما أنا قلت هذا
2. But doesn't follow after a حرف نفي, then it could be for تخصيص or الحكم. E.g. أنا تقوّي الحكم  
هو يعطي الجزيل and سعيث في حاجتك

B: If it is نكرة

1. It will be for تخصيص of the جنس. E.g. رجل جاءني, i.e. لا امرأة.
2. Or being singled out for the خبر فعلي. E.g. رجل جاءني, i.e. لا رجلا.

On page 35 it's said that Sakkaki agrees in all of that except the following: تقديم only gives the benefit of تخصيص if:

1. The word would have been مؤخر if made فاعل معنوي.
2. It must be supposed (in the mind) by the متكلم to have been brought forward and that it initially was مؤخر.

If both of these conditions are not fulfilled, then it will only give the benefit of تقوي الحكم. So in the case of condition #2 missing - e.g. not presuming that أنا قمت prior - the only benefit that is obtained is تقوي الحكم. If condition #1 is missing, then #2 is not even applicable, so only تقوي الحكم is achieved - like in: زيد قام (as زيد would become فاعل حقيقي if made مؤخر, according to Sakkaki).

This view hits a roadblock in the example of: رجل جاءني; Sakkaki, however, cops out by saying that رجل would become the بدل (i.e. فاعل معنوي) of the جاء. This way تخصيص is still achieved in the example.

---

*Wait.. كناية عن what now?*

---

On page 60 it is mentioned that sometimes a transitive verb (الفعل المتعدي) is utilized as (نزل منزلة) an intransitive verb (الفعل اللازم) and there is no implication of a direct object (مفعول به) when the verb is used.

On page 61 it mentions that the transitive verb being utilized as intransitive is of 2 types:

1. either that verb (whilst not having an object [مطلقاً]) is made tantamount to [كناية عن] the same verb in the state that it is linked [متعلقاً] to a specific object upon which context denotes;
2. or [the verb is] not [made tantamount to the same verb linked to a specific object upon which context denotes].

Understand it with the following example: يعطي زيد. The verb is being utilized as intransitive (اللازم); it can be used in 2 ways, as mentioned prior. According to the first way, this sentence means يعطي زيد شيئاً مخصوصاً. According to the second way: يفعل زيد الإعطاء. In the former way there is an implied object, in the latter way there is no implied object, because the meaning is that Zayd performed the action of giving, not that he gave something specific.

Note: In both these cases, the verb is made as لازم, it is only that at times an object is necessary to presume to have it make sense meaning-wise. But the point of the verb is to only affirm or negate the action for the فاعل (as opposed to the next type - where the purpose is beyond affirming or negating the verb from the فاعل).